

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,622	02/24/2004	Kazumasa Inoue	TKMTP127	2045
22434 7:	590 10/13/2005	EXAMINER		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
· Office Action Commence	10/786,622	INOUE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	William K. Cheung	1713
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a re I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•	
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 s This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matte	
·		
A) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin 10.	eawn from consideration. For election requirement. For election requirement. For election requirement objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand objection is required if the drawing(s)	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Apporting documents have been in the properties of t	oplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) –

Application/Control Number: 10/786,622 Page 2

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of amendment filed September 23, 2005, claims 12-17 have been cancelled. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerkar et al. (US patent 5,604,273) in view of Ohta et al. (US Patent 5,660,626), further in view of Berke et al. (US Patent 5,571,319), and yet, still further in view of Kloetzer et al. (US Patent 4,927,463) for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 4 of non-final office action of September 23, 2005.

Application/Control Number: 10/786,622

Art Unit: 1713

Applicant's arguments filed September 23, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue the each of the prior art employed by the examiner in the 103 rejection set forth does not contain all the features that are required by the claimed multifunctional admixture. However, applicants fail to recognize that under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is proper for the examiner to combine references for a 103 rejection. Further, since applicants fail to provide adequate reasons for why the references set forth are not combinable, the rejection set forth is proper.

Priority

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on March 3, 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 2003-55175 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1713

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K. Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William K. Cheung

Primary Examiner

October 8, 2005